Frederick Ward Associates, Inc.

Community Input Meeting

Harford Community College West Campus Phase I

Project No. 2081172.00

DATE: February 18, 2009

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

LOCATION: Harford Community College
Chesapeake Center - Board Room
401 Thomas Run Road
Bel Air, MD 21015

PRESENT: *See Sign-In Sheet*

PURPOSE: The purpose of this meeting is to present the subdivision and site plan for the Harford Community College West Campus Phase I project to the community and to answer any questions the public may have regarding this development.

PROCEEDINGS:

The meeting was opened at approximately 6:00 p.m. by Mr. Small; providing a brief introduction, description of the CIM and development process and description of the subject plans.

- Site location and surrounding development
- Introduction - Ownership/Developer - Harford Community College Board of Trustees
- History of the College Master Plan Process and the Towson University Expansion
- A rendered site plan illustrating the proposed development as well as an aerial view of the campus and surrounding area was available for review and discussion.

DISCUSSION

- A question was asked about the screening adjacent to residentially used property such as 12-inch high trees and shrubs vs. real trees. Mr. Small responded that significant trees such as various pines around 6 to 7 feet tall would be planted in accordance to standard Harford County buffer yard requirements. That being said, these areas could be enhanced with additional plantings.

- A question was asked to define "mitigate". Mr. Small described terms of what Adequate Public Facilities (APF) criteria means. He related this description to delay at the intersection.

- A question and statement was asked how would the Route 22 improvements be affected by the Route 22 referendum that there would be no expansion of Route 22. The citizen pointed out that there may be a conflict with the referendum and the APF law. Mr. Small replied that the County and SHA would need to review this in terms of the APF requirements.

- A question was asked if there was only one access point onto Thomas Run Road and were there any plans to connect to Prospect Mill Road. Mr. Small responded that indeed there is only one access point onto Thomas Run Road and deferred to Mr. Cox about Prospect Mill Road. Mr. Cox responded that the college has no plans now to build an access road onto Prospect Mill Road. Mr. small explained about the nature of the topography and environmental issues and the fact that Prospect Mill Road would not be an acceptable road to connect to.

- A statement was made that there were rumors that dormitories were planned on the West Campus. Mr. Cox replied that the Master Plan does show future dorms but the position of the college was that this is more of a long term option that may very well not happen.

- There were multiple questions asked about water supply for this expansion and how will this affect their wells. Mr. Steere responded that there are 4 existing wells located on the East Campus. Engineering investigations would need to be undertaken as to whether additional wells would be required. Mr. Garey from HCC Facilities responded that the college has an existing allocation of 20,000 GPD. The college currently used 13,000 GPD. The college will be using low-flow and other water saving devices in the new buildings to minimize the amount of water needed. This will be determined during the design phase at this project and will be in compliance with the Maryland Department of the Environment regulations.

- A question was asked about when will the construction begin. Dr. Deal replied January of 2010. A discussion then followed that this was too soon.

- A question was asked how to stop this project. No response was given.

- A statement was made by a citizen that he thought it was appalling that this was a money-making venture and he didn't appreciate an "Enterprise Zone" in the Churchville area disguised in the name of education.

- Another citizen questioned why the Thomas Run Park can't be converted into the Towson campus. This citizen stated that the President of the College should address the citizens' concerns.

- Another citizen's commented that with all the additional students, these students will be competing with existing traffic along Thomas Run Road. What were the plans of the college to address this foot traffic across Thomas Run Road and was an aerial walkway considered. Mr. Small replied that this has not been explored.

- A question was asked if there was a property value study done and if not, is there a compatible study done elsewhere. Mr. Small replied there was no study done and he knew of no comparable studies.

- A citizen asked how people will be notified about the forward progress of the project. Mr. Small replied that DAC would be on March 18, 2009 and that there would be an announcement in the local newspapers. Also, properties immediately adjoining the boundary of the college would be notified. Mr. Schaffer added that all citizens of Jacobs Well will be notified as well. The college requested that the additional notifications be made for the CIM Meeting and will notify the same citizens for the DAC process.

- A citizen was concerned about the campus smoking policy and she had fears about student gathering on their property to smoke. She had concerns about the trespassing, trash, etc.

- A question was asked about what are the next envisioned improvements to the campus. Mr. Cox responded that more than likely a new nursing facility would be built on the East Campus.

- A citizen asked if any buildings were serviced by the Campus Hills water supply. Mr. Garey replied that no HCC buildings were supplied by the Campus Hills water supply system.

- The same citizen asked if fire supply was provided by the Campus Hills water supply system. Mr. Garey replied the campus has its own fire protection system including underground storage tanks and fire pumps.

- A citizen inquired about the current number of parking spaces on campus. DR. Deal replied there were in excess of 2,000 existing spaces.

- A citizen read a prepared statement about how the Stormwater management facilities were shown and his thoughts as to how SWM should be designed (see attached statement). Mr. Small and Mr. Schaffer responded that the SWM facility was shown as a requirement of the preliminary plan process and that a note is on the plans that states that the SWM design will be in accordance with The Maryland Department of the Environment 2000 guidelines. A statement was also made by Mr. Small that the college is required to achieve a certification of LEED Silver or greater and Frederick Ward Associates will design the facilities accordingly and that FWA and HCC are leaders in the LEED design requirements in the area.

- A citizen asked if the traffic consultant would give a presentation about the traffic impact study required for this project. Mr. Keeley of Traffic Concepts was introduced. He discussed the County's TIA requirements. A citizen asked what specific intersections were investigated. Mr. Keeley explained. Another citizen asked why some intersections were picked and others were not. Mr. Keeley replied that the intersections studied were supplied to them through Harford County. Mr. Keeley informed the group of citizens his recommendations and took questions about the details. Mr. Keeley repeated that according to TIA legislation, the study is only required to make improvements related to the addition of traffic and particular to this project.

- A citizen asked if the BRAC impacts were part of this study and if not, why? Mr. Keeley replied that BRAC impacts were not included since this project is more than 2 miles from APG and other studies are being done by SHA to address BRAC.

- A citizen made a comment about what impact improvements along MD Route 22 had on businesses along the path of these improvements. He stated that improvements are made intersection to intersection, and typically the intersection fails before the road. SHA will improve the roads between intersections.

- Another citizen asked about the time of day the traffic counts were made and if there were any emergencies at Jacobs Well Court. Mr. Keeley explained when the counts were done and that he did not recall any emergencies. The citizen then stated the length of time of the traffic counts was too short.

- Another citizen made a statement that the folks conducting traffic control along Thomas Run Road were not professionals and she was concerned about safety.

She stated that Thomas Run Road needed improvements now and she made reference to the conflicts with the various schools letting out, busses blocking traffic, etc.

- Mr. Small made a statement that there is an undertaking by the County, to involve the State and all parties involved to jointly look at the bigger traffic issues. Mr. Small stated he did not know about the status of this review.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

This report represents the planner's summation of the proceedings and is not a transcript although an attempt was made to document/summarize what was said in dialogue fashion.

Submitted by:

Frederick Ward Associates, Inc.

Lou Schaffer
Project Planner

John Yasalonis
603 Prospect Mill Rd
Bel Air, MD 21015
18 Feb 2009
410-273-2607

Introduction

For a college that is a signatory to the Tallories Declaration, a member and awardee of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education and a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) participant, the stormwater management pond solution proposed in the current development plan is a very "old style' solution for your stormwater runoff from this proposed development. It does not include any of the LEED, Low Impact Design or proposed Maryland Stormwater Management Act of 2007 best management practices currently available for stormwater management.

Specific points:

- The plan proposes 483,608 SF of impervious surface. Approximately 11.1 acres of total impervious surface mainly parking and approximately 1.9 acres are buildings. Only one inch of rain on this area will produce nearly 1 acre-foot of water....Over 300,000 gallons; much of which will flow to the proposed stormwater pond.
  - The initial grading at the rear-center of the site for the entry to the swale is very steep, dropping 30 feet in a 60 foot distance. A similar slope is at the rear North corner.
  - From that center rear entry, the discharge of stormwater is proposed to flow over an extended length of travel to the pond. Depending on where you start/end measurement, the length is 1200-1500 feet in a 5 foot wide grass-only swale built on moderately erodible soils. Note that these soils have a long history of tilling for farming which can increase the standard erodibility K-factor given to the site.
  - Grading the swale and pond will both have multiple impacts on land in the Natural Resource Buffer. Any grading errors at the pond will immediately affect wetlands.
  - Oil, rubber, trash and other materials from the parking lot, sediment from the length of travel over erodible soils can cloud water, fill the pond with sediment and add nutrients..... all of which may reduce water quality for the receiving stream and wetlands associated with the proposed stormwater pond and that will increase your pond maintenance requirements.
- Any water stored in the pond during the hot months will be a significant heat sink. Any large inflow will release the heated water to the adjoining wetlands and streams with potentially serious ill-effects on the fish, reptiles and invertebrates downstream.
- The proposed pond is approximately 240 feet by 300 feet by 25-30 feet deep in the center. It is in a relatively isolated area. When only partially full it will be a potential safety hazard for drowning and will require at least fencing—even so it will remain a legal liability for HCC.

Recommendations:

I believe the following recommendations will improve the development plan, support HCC sustainability goals, help protect downstream fish, reptiles and invertebrates and improve safety and reduce liability from a large and deep pond.

1. Don't simply settle for a traditional stormwater pond. The following will greatly reduce the needed size of a final stormwater pond and could even eliminate it in favor of a smaller, safer constructed wetland.

- Reduce stormwater runoff *quantity* by reducing impervious cover, increasing on-site infiltration, reducing or eliminating pollution from stormwater runoff, and eliminating contaminants. Potential technologies and strategies:
    - Include a cistern sized for the buildings similar to the one used at Joppa Hall to reuse stormwater volumes generated for non-potable uses such as cooling towers, landscape irrigation, toilet and urinal flushing and custodial uses.
    - Promote infiltration. Specify vegetated roofs, pervious paving, bio-swales, infiltration trenches and other measures to minimize impervious surfaces and reduce runoff at the source.

- Remove potential pollutants to improve runoff *quality.* Potential technologies and strategies:
    - Vegetated roofs, pervious pavement and nonstructural techniques (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, disconnection of imperviousness, rainwater recycling) reduce imperviousness and promote infiltration to reduce pollutant loadings.
    - Use integrated natural and mechanical treatment systems such as constructed wetlands, vegetated filters, and open channels as sustainable design strategies to treat stormwater runoff and remove pollutants.

- Consider use of a constructed wetland as the final stop for any remaining runoff. If a stormwater pond is still needed, move it closer to the facilities to reduce the length of travel and potential to move chemical and heat pollutants to the adjacent stream and wetlands.

2. Develop the West Campus site to meet your obligations as a Tallories signatory and AASHE member for sustainable development. If you use the recommended techniques for stormwater management at the West Campus development site you can gain various Sustainable Sites and Water Efficiency LEED credits. Additional LEED credits could be gathered under the Material & Resources category if the project is developed with them in mind.

- Construction Phase-Potential points available:
    - Sustainable Sites (SS)
        - SS P1 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control P2)
        - SS 5.1 (Habitat Protection and Restoration: Minimize site disturbance)
        - SS 6.1 (Stormwater Management - Quantity Control)
        - SS 6.2 (Stormwater Management - Quality Control)
    - Material & Resource (MR)
        - MR 5.1 (Regional Materials 10% by total job cost),
        - MR 5.2 (Regional Materials- 20% by total job cost)
        - MR 6 (Rapidly Renewable Materials - 2.5% total value of building materials)
- Post-construction- Potential points available:
    - Sustainable Sites (SS)
        - SS P1 (Erosion and Sedimentation Control P2)
        - SS 5.1 (Habitat Protection and Restoration: Minimize site disturbance)
        - SS 6.1 (Stormwater Management - Quantity Control)
        - SS 6.2 (Stormwater Management - Quality Control)
    - Water Efficiency (WE)
        - WE 1.1 (Water Efficient Landscaping, Reduce by 50%)
        - WE 1.2 (Water Efficient Landscaping, no potable water)
    - Material & Resource (MR)
        - Material MR 5.1 (Regional Materials- 10% by total job cost),
        - MR 5.2 (Regional Materials- 20% by total job cost)